

REMARKS

The Office Action of June 2, 2004 (Paper No. 05242004) has been carefully considered.

Claim 12 is being canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 18 are being amended. Thus, claims 1-11 and 13-20 are pending in the application.

In response to the objection to the drawings, proposed corrections to Figures 2A, 2B and 7-9 are being submitted herewith. Acceptance of the drawing corrections in the next Office Action is requested.

The Abstract is being amended to comply with the requirements set forth on page 2 of the Office Action.

With respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 (second paragraph) appearing on pages 3-4 of the Office Action, Applicant is not claiming the combination of the apparatus, computer equipment and vehicle. Specifically, Applicant's invention does not add any new component to the computer equipment or the vehicle.

Rather, as indicated in the preamble of each independent claim, the invention is an apparatus for mounting a computer system in a vehicle. Thus, the preamble and the body of each claim do not recite any inventive function or feature of the computer equipment or vehicle. For example, the body of original claim 1 merely recited that the first member is fixed to the floor of the vehicle, and that the computer equipment is merely held by the holding frame means, both recitations being consistent with the

function of the apparatus as recited in the preamble of the claim.

It is respectfully submitted that the form of these claims is consistent with the form of numerous other claims submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office by the undersigned attorney over the past thirty years, and is consistent with the form of numerous claims appearing in patents issued by the Patent and Trademark Office. For example, see the following: claim 1 (line 5) of Hall et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,751,548; claim 1 (paragraph c) of Boos et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,260,486; claim 1 (paragraph b) of Schultz, U.S. Patent No. 6,315,252; and claims 1, 6, 7, 14 and 16 of Twyford, U.S. Patent No. 6,386,413; each of which is cited in the present application.

Nevertheless, in an effort to comply with the Examiner's determinations, claims 1 and 18 are being amended to delete mention of the vehicle in the body of the claims, and claims 5, 10 and 14 are being amended to replace "said" with "the" before "computer equipment".

Turning to consideration of the rejection of claims 11 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C.102, for alleged anticipation by Hall et al '548, claim 11 is being amended to include the recitation of dependent claim 12, which is being canceled. Since claim 12 was merely objected to and was not rejected based on prior art, independent claim 11 and associated dependent claims 13-17 should now be in condition for allowance.

Finally, with regard to the rejection of independent claim 18 under 35 U.S.C.102 for alleged anticipation by Boos et al '486, it is submitted that the cited patent does not disclose or suggest each element and function recited in claim 18. Specifically, whereas the Examiner cites the monitor support assembly 101 of Figure 1 of Boos et al '486 as corresponding to the "bearing rod means" recited in claim 18, the monitor support

assembly 101 of the patent does not perform the function of "bearing against a portion of the vehicle so as to provide stabilizing support for said holding frame means" (quoting from the last paragraph of claim 18).

To the contrary, Boos et al '486 discloses the following: (1) monitor support assembly 101 does not contact any portion of a vehicle (or any object external to the stand 1) for the purpose of stabilization; (2) monitor support assembly 101 is secured on one side to a leaf 16 of a leaf assembly 6 of the stand 1 (see column 6, lines 6-7 of the patent); and (3) monitor support assembly 101 has an upper section 113 which is adapted for positioning adjacent to opposite faces of a monitor/lid 120 of a laptop computer 2 so as to secure the monitor/lid 120 in the open position (see column 6, lines 20-24 of the patent).

Thus, Boos et al '486 not only fails to disclose the function of "bearing against a portion of the vehicle so as to provide stabilizing support for said holding frame means" (quoting from the last paragraph of claim 18), but also Boos et al '486 actually teaches away from the latter function by providing monitor support assembly 101 with the entirely different and unrelated function of connecting the monitor/lid 120 to the stand 1 so as to secure the monitor/lid 120 in the open position. In fact, Boos et al '486 does not provide at all for stabilizing the stand 1 by bearing against a portion of a vehicle, as recited in claim 18, or against any other object external to the stand 1.


As a result it is submitted that the invention of claim 18 is not disclosed or suggested in Boos et al '486 so that rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 is inappropriate.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance, and early issuance thereof is solicited. If any further issues remain in this application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at the below-listed local telephone number in order to expedite allowance.

A Petition for Extension of Time is being submitted herewith. Please charge the extension fee and any shortage of fees to Deposit Account No. 19-1070 (44.1004). Any fee due is authorized above.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert H. TWYFORD

By: 
Joseph G. Seeber
Reg. No. 27,719

Post Office Box 750
Great Falls, VA 22066
Telephone: (703)430-1702
Facsimile: (703)450-7914

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☒ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.